UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/435,540	11/08/1999	STEVEN R. DONOVAN	RIC99057	5356

25537	7590	06/11/2002

WORLDCOM, INC.
TECHNOLOGY LAW DEPARTMENT
1133 19TH STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER
PARTON, KEVIN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 06/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-31_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20 and 31_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _21-30_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _10-12_ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Schulzrinne et al. (1999) in view of Gutman et al. (6,298,383)

3.   Regarding claim 1, Schulzrinne et al. (1999) teach a system for providing Internet

Protocol (IP) communications over at least one network with Quality of Service (QoS),

comprising the steps of:

  a. Means for establishing at least one QoS policy in at least one network node

   (page 1). Note that both RSVP and differentiated services are considered QoS

   policy.

  b. Means for initiating a communication session between at least one first end

   client device and at least one second end client device (page 1). Note that IP

   telephony as an application implies the connection of at least two client

   devices.

  c. Means for providing information to at least one router of the communication

   session, said information including at least one of resource usage, policy,

   authorization, authentication, and accounting information (page 3). Note that

in the reference, the "egress router" would have some resource usage

information sent to it to determine the reserved path.

    d. Means for establishing a communication session between said at least one first

end client device and said at least one second end client device (page 1). Note

that the application of IP telephony implies communication between at least 2

client devices; the method of connection is described in the reference.

Although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) shows substantial features of

the claimed invention, it fails to specifically disclose:

    a. Means for providing information to at least one server of the communication

session, said information including at least one of resource usage, policy,

authorization, authentication, and accounting information.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999), as evidenced by Gutman et al.

(6,298,383).

In an analogous art, Gutman et al. (6,298,383) disclose:

    a. Means for providing information to at least one server of the communication

session, said information including at least one of resource usage, policy,

authorization, authentication, and accounting information (column 3, lines 4-

11). Note that the determination of the incoming message as wholesale or

retail user is authorization and/or authentication information.

Given the teaching of Gutman et al. (6,298,383), a person having ordinary skill in the art

would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al.

(1999) by employing the passing of parameters to an authorization, authentication, and accounting server. The advantages of doing this include centralization of security and access policy, and access only to privileged system administrators. This separation of function makes the system more secure and more reliable.

4.   Regarding claim 2, Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. Schulzrinne further teaches means wherein said step of establishing at least one QoS policy in at least one network node uses a Differentiated Services model (page 1).

5.   Regarding claim 6, although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) (as applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein said at least one server is a policy server, the step of providing information to said at least one server of the communication session, further comprises the steps of:

      a. Sending a message requesting said at least one of resource usage, policy, authorization, authentication, and accounting information to at least one policy server, and

      b. Sending a message responding to the message in (a) with at least one of resource usage, policy, authorization, authentication, and accounting information; wherein said at least one of resource usage, policy, authorization, authentication, and accounting information is according to the at least one QoS policy.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999), as evidenced by Gutman et al.

(6,298,383) (6,298,383) (as applied to claim 1 and as further stated below).

In an analogous art, Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383) discloses means wherein said

at least one server is a policy server, the step of providing information to said at least one server

of the communication session, further comprises the steps of:

    a. Sending a message requesting said at least one of resource usage, policy,

        authorization, authentication, and accounting information to at least one

        policy server (column 3, lines 4-11). Note that in the reference, the passing of

        the incoming packets constitutes the sending of a message to the policy or

        AAA server, and

    b. Sending a message responding to the message in (a) with at least one of

        resource usage, policy, authorization, authentication, and accounting

        information (column 3, lines 9-11); wherein said at least one of resource

        usage, policy, authorization, authentication, and accounting information is

        according to the at least one QoS policy.

Given the teaching of Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383), a person having ordinary skill in

the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne

et al. (1999) by sending messages to and from the policy server. The benefit of passing QoS

parameters to and from this policy server is the increased oversight and the ability to alter QoS

policy and decisions at a single point.

6.   Regarding claim 7, although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) (as

applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means

wherein steps (a) and (b) are performed on a plurality of policy servers, one of the plurality of

policy server being a local policy server for the first end client device, and one of the plurality of

policy servers being a local policy server for the second end client device.

        Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999), as evidenced by Gutman et al.

(6,298,383) (6,298,383) (as applied to claim 6 and as further stated below).

        In an analogous art, Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383) discloses means wherein steps

(a) and (b) of claim 6 are performed on a plurality of policy servers (column 1 line 66-column 3,

line 4), one of the plurality of policy server being a local policy server for the first end client

device, and one of the plurality of policy servers being a local policy server for the second end

client device. Note that the reference teaches the distribution of AAA servers to different

domains. This is analogous to the claimed invention.

        Given the teaching of Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383), a person having ordinary

skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying

Schulzrinne et al. (1999) by employing multiple servers for clients in different domains. This

allows for increased flexibility in policy and on the system in general. Users in each domain

would be able to establish and implement policy specific to their function instead of adhering to

the policy of the administrative center.

7.   Regarding claim 9, Schulzrinne et al. (1999) teach means wherein the step of providing

information to at least one router of the communication session, further comprises the steps of:

    a. Sending a message installing policy to at least one router (page 3). Note that

       RSVP message is included in communication to egress router.

    b. Sending a message (from the router) (page 4). Note that in the reference this

       is not a message confirming installation.

Although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) (as applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose:

    a. Sending a message requesting a local policy decision; and

    b. Sending a message (from the router) confirming installation.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999), as evidenced by Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383) (as applied to claim 1 above and further discussed below).

In an analogous art, Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383) discloses:

    a. Sending a message requesting a local policy decision (page 3-4); and

Given the teaching of Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al. (1999) by having routers request local policy decisions. This allows the routers to be updated with the most current usage statistic, or authentication information.

Further, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al. (1999) by having a message sent from the router to confirm installation of said local policy decision. This is necessary and advantageous because the server is able to accurately manage all routers on which the policy has

been installed, not just those that the policy was sent to. Any errors in communication or installation can be remedied with a re-submission of the policy to the router.

8.   Regarding claim 10, Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 9. Schulzrinne further teaches means wherein the at least one router performs according to a Differentiated Services model (page 1).

9.   Regarding claim 11, Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 9. Schulzrinne et al. (1999) further disclose means wherein steps (a)-(c) (from claim 9) are performed on a plurality of routers, one of the plurality of routers being a local router for the first end client device, and one of the plurality of routers being a local router for the second end client device (page 3). Note that Schulzrinne et al. (1999) do not limit the number of involved routers and the location in relation to the clients.

10.   Regarding claim 13, although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) (as applied to claim 7) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein said network includes at least one clearinghouse server, said clearinghouse server providing resource usage, policy, authentication, authorization, and accounting information to each of said plurality of policy servers, said method further comprising the steps of:

         a. Means for sending a message requesting at least one of resource usage, policy, authentication, authorization, and accounting information to the at least one clearinghouse server; and

         b. Means for sending a message including at least one of resource usage, policy, authentication, authorization, and accounting information to the at least one policy server.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al, as evidenced by Gutman et al.

(6,298,383) (6,298,383).

In an analogous art, Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383) discloses means wherein said

network includes at least one clearinghouse server (referred to as GRS or proxy server in

reference), said clearinghouse server providing resource usage, policy, authentication,

authorization, and accounting information to each of said plurality of policy servers (column 2,

lines 14-23), said method further comprising the steps of:

- a. Means for sending a message including at least one of resource usage, policy,

  authentication, authorization, and accounting information to the at least one

  policy server (column 2, lines 14-23). Note that in the reference, the GRS

  server sends authorization, authentication, and accounting (AAA) information

  to local AAA databases in separate domains. This is similar information to

  that in the claimed clearinghouse server.

Given the teaching of Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383), a person having ordinary

skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying

Schulzrinne et al. (1999) by employing a clearinghouse server to send AAA information to the

policy servers local to each client or system. This is advantageous because it allow for multiple

levels of control. The central administrator can make policy decisions for all domain servers,

while each domain server can be configured for that specific domain.

Also, it would further be obvious that the policy servers could send a message requesting

at least one of resource usage, policy, authentication, authorization, and accounting information

to the at least one clearinghouse server. Doing this is advantageous because it removes the need

for constant update by the clearinghouse server and free up resources for other communication.

11.   Regarding claim 14, although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and

Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (6,298,383) (as applied to claim 13) shows substantial features of the

claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein steps (a) and (b) use an open Settlement

Policy (OSP).

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383)

(6,298,383)

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability

and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne and Gutman by employing the use of an Open

Settlement Policy for these steps. Doing this is advantageous because OSP was specifically

designed for use in Internet telephony and communications and is optimized for this application.

12.   Regarding claim 15, although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) (as

applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means

wherein the network uses an authorization token to indicate that a session is authorized.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999)

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability

and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al by utilizing an authorization token. The use of a

token is advantageous because it allows for control of each entity utilizing the service.

Authorized sessions can be monitored and accurately logged for system administrators and

security applications. Note that any of a number of authorization methods would have been appropriate.

13. Claims 3, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Eriksson et al.

14. Regarding claim 3, although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (as applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the step of initiating a communication session further comprises the steps of:

     a. Sending an initiation message from said at least one first end client device to said at least one second end client device;

     b. Sending a message indicating receipt of said initiation message by the at least one second end client device;

     c. Sending a message indicating the at least one second end client device is responding to the initiation message; and

     d. sending a message indicating a receipt of the message in (c) by the at least one first end client device and signaling the start of the communication session.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383), as evidenced by Eriksson et al. (1999)

In an analogous art, Eriksson et al. (1999) disclose means wherein the step of initiating a communication session further comprises the steps of:

a. Sending an initiation message from said at least one first end client device to said at least one second end client device (page 15);

b. Sending a message indicating receipt of said initiation message by the at least one second end client device (page 15);

c. Sending a message indicating the at least one second end client device is responding to the initiation message (page 15); and

d. sending a message indicating a receipt of the message in (c) by the at least one first end client device and signaling the start of the communication session (page 15).

Given the teaching of Eriksson et al. (1999), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) by this set of call initiation steps. These steps are intrinsic to the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) that is specifically geared and optimized for Internet Telephony and high priority communications over the Internet. It is therefore a clear choice for this application.

15.   Regarding claim 4, although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) (as applied to claim 3) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein said steps (a)-(d) use a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP).

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383), as evidenced by Eriksson et al. (1999).

In an analogous art, Eriksson et al. (1999) disclose means said steps (a)-(d) use a Session

Initiation Protocol (SIP) (page 14-15).

Given the teaching of Eriksson et al. (1999), a person having ordinary skill in the art

would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al

and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) by employing SIP. This is a session initiation standard that can be

adhered to by any of a number of systems. Using this is advantageous here because Session

Initiation Protocol (SIP) is specifically geared and optimized for Internet Telephony and high

priority communications over the Internet. It is therefore a clear choice for this application.

Standardization also allows for the rapid insertion of new client devices. Note that any

serviceable session initiation protocol could be applied.

16.   Regarding claim 5, Schulzrinne et al. (1999), Gutman et al. (6,298,383), and Eriksson et

al. (1999) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 3. Schulzrinne further teaches means

wherein said network includes at least one server for receiving and forwarding initiation

messages (page 12). Note that in the reference, the INVITE message is the initiation message

that is forwarded.

17.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulzrinne et al.

(1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Boyle et

al. (1999).

Although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383)

(as applied to claim 6) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose

means wherein said steps (a) and (b) (of claim 6) use a Common Open Policy Service (COPS).

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383),

as evidenced by Boyle et al. (1999).

In an analogous art, Boyle et al disclose means wherein said steps like (a) and (b) (of

claim 6) use a Common Open Policy Service (COPS) (page 3). Note that in the reference, the

requests of the PEP conform to the steps a) and b) of claim 6.

Given the teaching of Boyle et al. (1999), a person having ordinary sill in the art would

have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al. (1999)

and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) by employing COPS. Using this is advantageous here because

COPS is specifically geared and optimized for Internet Telephony and high priority

communications over the Internet. Any standard for trading of parameters would be beneficial in

the claimed system due to the fact that it gives a known interface for new clients.

18.   Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulzrinne et al.

(1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Boyle et

al. (1999).

Although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383)

(as applied to claim 9) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose

means wherein steps (a)-(c) (of claim 9) use a Common Open Policy Service (COPS).

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious

modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383),

as evidenced by Boyle et al. (1999).

In an analogous art, Boyle et al disclose means wherein said steps like (a)-(c) (of claim 9) use a Common Open Policy Service (COPS) (page 3). Note that in the reference, the requests of the PEP conform to the steps (a)-(c) of claim 9.

Given the teaching of Boyle et al. (1999), a person having ordinary sill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) by employing COPS. Any standard for trading of parameters would be beneficial in the claimed system due to the fact that it gives a known interface for new clients. Using this is advantageous here because COPS is specifically geared and optimized for Internet Telephony and high priority communications over the Internet.

19.   Claims 16-20 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulzrinne et al. (1999) in view of Gutman et al. (6,298,383) and Eriksson et al. (1999)

20.   Regarding claim 16, Schulzrinne et al. (1999) teach a system for providing Internet Protocol (IP) communications over at least one network with Quality of Service (QoS), comprising the steps of:

> a. Establishing at least one QoS policy in at least one network node (page 1).
>   Note that both RSVP and differentiated services are considered QoS policy.
>
> b. Providing information to at least one router of the communication session,
>   said information including at least one of resource usage, policy,
>   authorization, authentication, and accounting information (page 3). Note that
>   in the reference, the "egress router" would have some resource usage
>   information sent to it to determine the reserved path.

Although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to specifically disclose:

    a. Terminating a communication session between at least one first end client device and at least one second end client device.

    b. Means for providing information to at least one server of the communication session, said information including at least one of resource usage, policy, authorization, authentication, and accounting information.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999), as evidenced by Eriksson et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383).

In an analogous art, Eriksson et al. (1999) disclose Terminating a communication session between at least one first end client device and at least one second end client device (page 32-33, figure 12).

Given the teaching of Eriksson et al. (1999), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Gutman et al. (6,298,383) by terminating the connection at the completion of the communication. This frees up resources for concurrent communications.

In an analogous art, Gutman et al. (6,298,383) disclose:

    b. Means for providing information to at least one server of the communication session, said information including at least one of resource usage, policy, authorization, authentication, and accounting information (column 3, lines 4-

11). Note that the determination of the incoming message as wholesale or retail user is authorization and/or authentication information.

Given the teaching of Gutman et al. (6,298,383), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al. (1999) by employing the passing of parameters to an authorization, authentication, and accounting server. The advantages of doing this include centralization of security and access policy, and access only to privileged system administrators. This separation of function makes the system more secure and more reliable.

21.   Regarding claim 17, Schulzrinne et al. (1999), Gutman et al. (6,298,383), and Eriksson et al. (1999) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 16. Schulzrinne further teaches means wherein said step of establishing at least one QoS policy in at least one network node uses a Differentiated Services model (page 1).

22.   Regarding claim 18, Schulzrinne et al. (1999), Gutman et al. (6,298,3836), and Eriksson et al. (1999) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 16. Eriksson et al. (1999) further teach

     a. Sending a termination message from the said at least first end client device to said at least one second end client device (page 33, figure 13)

     b. Sending a message indicating receipt of said termination message by the at least one second end client device (page 33, figure 13). Note that the BYE message is the termination

Given the teaching of Eriksson et al. (1999), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al. (1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) by this set of call termination steps. These steps are

intrinsic to the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) that is specifically geared and optimized for

Internet Telephony and high priority communications over the Internet. It is therefore a clear

choice for this application.

23.   Regarding claim 19, Schulzrinne et al. (1999), Gutman et al. (6,298,383), and Eriksson et

al. (1999) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 18. Eriksson et al. (1999) further teach

means wherein said steps (a)-(b) use a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) (page 33).

        Given the teaching of Eriksson et al. (1999), a person having ordinary skill in the art

would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al.

(1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) by employing SIP. This is a session initiation standard that

can be adhered to by any of a number of systems. Standardization allows for the rapid insertion

of new client devices. Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) is specifically geared and optimized for

Internet Telephony and high priority communications over the Internet. It is therefore a clear

choice for this application.

24.   Regarding claim 20, Schulzrinne et al. (1999), Gutman et al. (6,298,383), and Eriksson et

al. (1999) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 16. Eriksson et al further teach means

wherein said network includes at least one additional server for receiving and forwarding

termination messages (page 33, figure 13).

        Given the teaching of Eriksson et al. (1999), a person having ordinary skill in the art

would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al.

(1999) and Gutman et al. (6,298,383) by using a server in the path of a termination message.

This allows a central server to maintain a log of all activity and all available client machines for

system usage statistics and call routing. This monitoring is advantageous because it increases the oversight of administrators and security policy.

25.   Regarding claim 31, although the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999) (as applied to claim 16) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the network uses an authorization token to indicate that a session is authorized.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Schulzrinne et al. (1999)

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Schulzrinne et al by utilizing an authorization token. This is a commonly used method and fits well within the paradigm claimed. The use of a token is advantageous because it allows for control of each entity utilizing the service. Authorized sessions can be monitored and accurately logged for system administrators and security applications. Note that any of a number of authorization methods would have been appropriate.

Allowable Subject Matter

26.   Claims 21-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

27.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chang (USPN 6,058,113), Chiu et al. (USPN 6,385,170), and Voit et al. (USPN 6,157,648) all teach systems similar in call setup to the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Parton whose telephone number is (703)306-0543. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703)305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-9242 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Kevin Parton
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

ksp
June 4, 2002

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100